

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. SAR 14256A

**REMARKS**

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated November 9, 2004, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on February 9, 2005. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1 - 27 remain pending in the application and are shown above. Claims 17 and 24 - 27 are rejected and claims 18 - 23 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested for reasons presented below.


The Examiner rejects Claims 17 and 24-27 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-3, 7 and 13 of U.S. Patent 6,657,706, issued December 3, 2003. The Examiner stated that "[a]lthough the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentable distinct from each other because the limitations of the claims in the present application are present in the corresponding claims of Levine."

Applicants have filed herewith a terminal disclaimer under 37 C.F.R. 1.130(b). As such, Applicants respectfully request that the obviousness-type double patenting rejection be withdrawn.

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

2/9/05  
Date

  
Kin-Wah Tong, Attorney  
Reg. No. 39,400  
(732) 530-9404  
Moser, Patterson & Sheridan, LLP  
595 Shrewsbury Avenue  
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702

Page 6

332067\_1